

Early in the morning on Sunday, as we were finishing up amendments on the Defense Appropriations bill, I debated an earmark challenge with the Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, Congressman John Murtha (D-PA). The earmark allocated \$2 million to Sherwin-Williams Paint Company to... Early in the morning on Sunday, as we were finishing up amendments on the Defense Appropriations bill, I debated an earmark challenge with the Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, Congressman John Murtha (D-PA). The earmark allocated \$2 million to Sherwin-Williams Paint Company to develop what they described as a "paint shield to protect against microbial attacks." As the sponsor of the amendment, Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs-Jones (D-OH) did not come down to defend her earmark. The defense was left to Congressman Murtha.

[Here is a link](#) to this brief debate, now keep in mind all I wanted to know was:

- 1) Is this project requested by the Department of Defense? The correct answer is NO.
- 2) Is this a project that was competitively bid among other potential suppliers? The correct answer again is NO.
- 3) Will the taxpayer own the rights to any successful product developed? Again, the correct answer, according to Sherwin-Williams' own brochure for this project is NO.
- 4) How do we know that this particular company is the best supplier? There are many great paint companies in America, how do we know that Sherwin-Williams is the right company to do this job? Answer never given.
- 5) What investigations have they done to ensure that this is the right price? Is \$2 million just an arbitrary amount? Answer never given.

For those of us in Congress fighting to reform our earmark process, this video is a good example of where we need to start.